

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/733,898	PRIMLANI, INDRU J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles G Freay	3746	

All Participants:
Status of Application: pending

 (1) Charles G Freay.

(3) _____.

 (2) Indru Primlani.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 February 2005
Time: 10:00 am
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 7, 8, 14-16, 22 and 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Hudson (USPN 3,775,973 and USPN 4,024,703)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner noted that the Hudson references anticipated independent claims 1 and 7 and further disclosed many features in other dependant claims. Primarily Hudson provided a teaching of three adiabatic combustor means (1, 2 and 3) operated in a sequential and alternating fashion in order to provide a substantially continuous flow of gaseous combustion product to a work producing means. The applicant agreed with this analysis. The examiner noted that if the mixing zone/ admixture arrangement set forth in dependant claims 2 and 8 were added to the independent claims then the claims would be in allowable form. the applicant agreed to let the examiner do this by examiner's amendment. The examiner also noted that in claims 14-16 the series or parallel arrangement should be set forth in separate claims so that it is clear that the work-producing means are set up either in a series or parallel arrangement. As written the claims could be interpreted to mean that in a fixed installation it would be possible to switch back and forth between series and parallel operation. This was not disclosed. The applicant agreed to these changes. In claims 22 and 23 it was agreed that the claims should be amended so that it was clear that the second conduit means was providing the gaseous combustion products to the noted devices and not the feeding means from the admixture arrangement. Further other minor amendments were agreed to which would be made for the purpose of readability..